

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claim 1 for the purposes of overcoming the rejections relating thereto, for expressing the subject matter more appropriately, and in respect of informalities. No new matter is added by this amendment. Claims 1-3 remain pending in the present application. Applicant highly appreciates Examiner's careful review of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed toward non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 by including materials of hardware or a combination of hardware and software for the purpose of overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. Amended claim 1 now recites the use of certain technologies, such as various software modules (i.e., an auto-count module, a data mining module, and a dynamic scanning module) configured in a computer (i.e., an application server) that would inherently and necessarily require a computer (i.e., the application server) that is connected to a physical readable medium (i.e., a designated database and a client computer). Furthermore, amended claim 1 now recites the system as being configured for carrying out functions which culminate in the forming of a practical result (i.e., a marked field) in a physical readable medium (i.e., the application server). The functions performed by various software modules (i.e., the auto-count module, the data mining module, and the dynamic scanning module) in the pieces of hardware (i.e., the application server connected with the designated database and the client computer) are necessary prerequisites for the application server to form the marked field. Furthermore, the "the marked field" achieved by the claimed characteristics of the system of amended claim 1 is a useful, concrete, and very tangible result.

For at least the above reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 2-3 depend from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by John C. Seibel et al. (US 2006/0004731, hereinafter “Seibel”).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Seibel. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

“a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark to form a marked field.”

Applicant submits that Seibel does not disclose, teach or suggest the invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in claim 1, as amended.

On pages 4 of the Office action, Examiner indicated that the presently claimed feature of **“marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark”** is equivalent to cited content “key phrase highlighting based on ... search criteria” disclosed by Seibel. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Seibel discloses that a system 10 implements an automated process of vertical industry intelligence building that involves automated reverse lookup of contact information using an email address and key phase highlighting based on business rules and a search criteria (paragraph [0019], lines 8-12). Keywords will be highlighted or

otherwise pointed to, in order to facilitate rapid location of relevant areas of a text when a document is located through a keyword search (paragraph [0074], lines 6-9).

According to these disclosures of Seibel, a key phase or a keyword can be highlighted based on a search criteria, and a keyword can be highlighted to rapidly locate relevant areas of a text. However, the claimed feature of “*an identified field of the structured information report*” is not disclosed or taught by Seibel. As claimed in claim 1, the feature of “**an identified field**” relates to an area that includes one or more numbers/words, or can be inputted one or more numbers/words. Such feature is supported by paragraph [0031] of the present application, as originally filed, and is not mentioned at all in Seibel. That is, the presently claimed feature of “**an identified field**” is apparent different from a key phase or a keyword disclosed by Seibel. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Seibel fails to disclose or teach the feature of “**a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report**,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Seibel does not disclose or teach what the search criteria is, and how to highlight the key phase or the keyword. That is, the presently claimed feature of “**a designated mark**” used to mark the identified field of the structured information report is not disclosed or taught by Seibel. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Seibel fails to disclose or teach the feature of “**a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark to form a marked field**,” as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant states that the system for visually mining information of the present invention is distinctly and patentably different from the system and/or method disclosed by Seibel.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that Seibel does not disclose, teach, or suggest the present invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 1. That is, amended claim 1 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over

Appl. No. 10/749,311
Amdt. Dated April 17, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed Jan. 25, 2008

Seibel, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Seibel. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Claims 2-3 depend from amended independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Thus claims 2-3 should also now be allowable

Appl. No. 10/749,311
Amdt. Dated April 17, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed Jan. 25, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Lee et al.

By /Frank R. Niranjan/ Date: April 17, 2008

Frank R. Niranjan

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649